UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,324	02/26/2002	Anatoliy Panasyuk	2006579-0420 (CTX-079)	4049

69665   7590   03/25/2008
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/083,324	PANASYUK ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	MATTHEW T. HENNING	2131	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 December 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-66 and 68</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-66 and 68</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 January 2007</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail. Date _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

1   This action is in response to the communication filed on 12/26/2007.

2   **DETAILED ACTION**

3   ***Response to Arguments***

4   Applicant's arguments filed 12/26/2007 have been fully considered and are not found

5   persuasive.

6   Applicant's argues that cited prior art does not render obvious the claim limitation that

7   the second ticket is disabled from use and is enabled upon validation of the first ticket. The

8   examiner disagrees. It is the service ticket transmitted from the TTP to Server A that reads on

9   the claimed second ticket. This ticket is not "enabled for use" by Server A until it is supplied to

10 Server A. In other words, how can server A use this server ticket if it has not been supplied to

11 server A. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

12   Claims 1-66, and 68 have been examined.

13   All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

14   ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

15   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

16 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

17   (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
18   section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
19   such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
20   having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
21   manner in which the invention was made.
22
23   Claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64, 66, and 68 rejected under 35 U.S.C.

24 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezak et al. (US Patent Application Publication

25 2003/0018913) hereinafter referred to as Brezak, as evidenced by Ganesan (US Patent Number

26 5,557,678).

1   Regarding claim 1, Brezak disclosed a method of authenticating a client to a content

2   server (See Brezak Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising the steps of: generating, by a ticket authority

3   (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206), a first ticket (TGT) and a second ticket (Service Ticket)

4   wherein said second ticket is disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045);

5   transmitting, by said ticket authority, said first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraph 0042-

6   0043); validating, by said ticket authority, said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and

7   0045-0048); using, by said client, said first ticket to establish a communication session with a

8   content server proxy after said first ticket is validated (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043-0045);

9   enabling, by said ticket authority, said second ticket for use upon said validation of said first

10   ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048); and using, by said content server proxy, said enabled

11   second ticket to establish a communication session with said content server (See Brezak

12   Paragraphs 0045-0048), but failed to disclose generating the second ticket before the first ticket

13   was validated. However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention that, in order to

14   avoid processor overloading, instead of generating data upon request, the data can be pre-

15   generated and stored for use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8 Final paragraph). Therefore, it

16   would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to have the TTP pre-generate at

17   least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for these tickets.

18   Regarding claim 23, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak

19   Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority (See

20   Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206); a content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 214); and a content

21   server proxy (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) in communication with said client, said ticket

22   authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2), wherein said ticket authority generates a

1   first ticket (TGT) and a second ticket (Service Ticket), wherein said first ticket is transmitted to

2   said client and used to establish a first communication session with said content server proxy

3   (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045), and wherein said second ticket is transmitted to

4   said content server proxy and used to establish a second communication session with said

5   content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045), but failed to disclose generating the

6   second ticket before the first ticket was validated. However, it was well known in the art at the

7   time of invention that, in order to avoid processor overloading, instead of generating data upon

8   request, the data can be pre-generated and stored for use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8

9   Final paragraph). Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art

10   to have the TTP pre-generate at least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for these

11   tickets.

12   Regarding claim 45, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak

13   Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority

14   generating a first ticket (TGT) and a second ticket (Service Ticket) wherein said second ticket is

15   disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); a content server (See Brezak

16   Fig. 2 Element 214); a content server proxy in communication with said client, said ticket

17   authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) and receiving said first ticket

18   (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0044); and a web server in communication with said client and

19   said ticket authority (See Brezak Fig. 1 Element 178 and Paragraphs 0031-0032), wherein said

20   content server proxy establishes a first communication session between said client and said

21   content server proxy after said ticket authority validates said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs

22   0043-0045), wherein said ticket authority enables said second ticket after said validation of said

1   first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048), and wherein said content server proxy uses said

2   enabled second ticket to establish a second communication session with a protocol different from

3   said first communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraph 0045), but failed to disclose

4   generating the second ticket before the first ticket was validated. However, it was well known in

5   the art at the time of invention that, in order to avoid processor overloading, instead of generating

6   data upon request, the data can be pre-generated and stored for use when requested (See Ganesan

7   Col. 8 Final paragraph). Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in

8   the art to have the TTP pre-generate at least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for

9   these tickets.

10   Regarding claim 68, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak

11   Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising; means for generating, by a ticket authority, a first ticket (TGT)

12   and a second ticket (Service Ticket) (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); means for

13   transmitting, by said ticket authority, said first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-

14   0043); means for using, by said client, said first ticket to establish a first communication session

15   with a content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045); means for transmitting, by

16   said ticket authority, said second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043

17   and 0045-0048); and means for using, by said content server proxy, said second ticket to

18   establish a second communication session with a content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-

19   0048), but failed to disclose generating the second ticket before the first ticket was validated.

20   However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention that, in order to avoid processor

21   overloading, instead of generating data upon request, the data can be pre-generated and stored for

22   use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8 Final paragraph). Therefore, it would have been

1   obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to have the TTP pre-generate at least the service

2   tickets prior to receiving a request for these tickets.

3   Regarding claims 2, 24, and 46, Brezak disclosed that prior to generating said

4   ticket associated with said client, said client is authenticated with a web server (See Brezak

5   Paragraphs 0042-0043).

6   Regarding claims 3, 25, and 47-48, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority

7   transmits said first ticket to a web server and said web server transmits said first ticket to said

8   client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032).

9   Regarding claims 4, 26, and 49, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first ticket

10   to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0043 and 0044).

11   Regarding claims 5, 27, and 50-51, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy

12   transmits said first ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority transmits said second

13   ticket to said content server proxy upon validation of said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs

14   0045-0048).

15   Regarding claims 6, 10, 28,32, 52 and 56, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy

16   transmits said second ticket to said content server upon said enabling of said second ticket (See

17   Brezak Paragraph 0036 and 0045).

18   Regarding claims 11, 33-34, and 57-58, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority

19   transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to a web server and said web server

20   transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs

21   0031-0032 and 0042-0043).

1   Regarding claims 12, 35, and 59, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first

2   ticket and said disabled second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043

3   and 0044).

4   Regarding claim 13, Brezak disclosed transmitting said disabled second ticket to at least

5   one of said content server proxy and a web server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043).

6   Regarding claims 36, and 60, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy transmits

7   said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority

8   enables said disabled second ticket (See Brezak Paragraph 0045).

9   Regarding claims 14, 37, and 61, Brezak disclosed transmitting said enabled second

10   ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0048).

11   Regarding claims 15, 38, and 62, Brezak disclosed that a communication session protocol

12   is established between said client and said content server (See Brezak Paragraph 0036).

13   Regarding claims 16-17, 39-40, and 63-64, Brezak disclosed that a first communication

14   session protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second

15   communication session protocol is established between said content server proxy and said

16   content server, wherein said first communication session protocol is different from said second

17   communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0036 and 0043), said client

18   communicating with said content server via said first communication session and said second

19   communication session (See Brezak Paragraphs 0041, 0043, 0044, and Fig. 2).

20   Regarding claims 18-19, and 41-42, Brezak disclosed that a first communication session

21   protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second

22   communication session protocol is established between said client and a web server, wherein

1   said first communication session protocol is different from said second communication session

2   protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032 and 0043).

3   Regarding claims 21, 44, and 66, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy is a

4   secure socket layer relay (See Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049, and 0053).

5

6   Regarding claims 20, 22, 43, and 65, Brezak disclosed a client system including many

7   features such as accessing web sites (See Brezak Paragraphs 0005 and 0016-0033), and

8   transmitting a second ticket to a proxy server for the use of a specifically identified server (See

9   Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049), but failed to disclose that the client comprised a web browser or

10   that the server was identified by its address. It was well known in the art at the time of invention

11   that computers had web browsers for accessing web sites. It was further well know in the art at

12   the time of invention that servers were identified by their address. Therefore, it would have been

13   obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide the client with

14   a web browser and to identify the target server by its address. This would have been obvious

15   because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to apply what was well

16   known and common in the art at the time.

17   Claims 7-9, 29-31, and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

18   over Brezak as applied to claims 1, 23, and 45 above, and further in view of Litai et al. (US

19   Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0233554) hereinafter referred to as Litai.

20   Brezak disclosed accessing a target server through a proxy server using a service ticket

21   (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048) but failed to disclose the specific method used for the target

22   server to verify the service ticket.

1   Litai teaches that in a ticketing system, in order for a server to verify a service ticket, the

2   server sends the ticket to the ticket server (See Litai Paragraph 0046).

3   It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of

4   invention to employ the teachings of Litai in the ticketing system by having the target server

5   send the service ticket to the trusted third party in order to have the ticket verified. This would

6   have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to

7   protect the server from unauthorized access.

8

9   *Conclusion*

10   Claims 1-66, and 68 have been rejected.

11   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

12   policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

13   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

14   MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

15   MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

16   the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

17   will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

18   CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

19   however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

20   date of this final action.

1   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

2 examiner should be directed to MATTHEW T. HENNING whose telephone number is

3 (571)272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

4   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

5 supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the

6 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

7   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

8 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

9 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

10 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

11 system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

12 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

13 like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

14 information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

15

16

17 /Matthew T Henning/

18 Examiner, Art Unit 2131

19

20 /Christopher A. Revak/

21 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2131